Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 174 (2015) 3523 – 3530

Procedia
Social and Behavioral Sciences

INTE 2014

The evaluation of the course description quality by students of the psychology teaching training programme

Dana Malá*, Michal Čerešník**

Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, Faculty of Education, Department of Pedagogy and School Psychology, Dražovská 4, 949 01 Nitra, Slovakia

Abstract

In our contribution we focus on the problem of the quality increase of university education and its evaluation by students in the last year of university study. The quality increase is an actual challenge which is analysed and practically implemented through various concepts, like KSC (knowledge, skills, competences) Typology (Wintertog, Delamare-Le Deist, & Stringfellow, 2006), Tuning Methodology (Gonzáles, & Wagenaar, 2008), Biggs' SOLO Taxonomy (Biggs, & Tang, 2007) or Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive education goals (Bloom et al., 1956; Krathwohl, 2002). Our attention is dominantly set onto these concepts, as well as on the practical outcomes which are the products of the projects solved at the University of Constantine the Philosopher in Nitra (Verešová, Žilová, & Vozár, 2012; Verešová, & Čerešník, 2013). The research problem was determined as the evaluation of the explicitness and the understandability of the changes in course descriptions of the study program subjects by the students of the Psychology teacher training program. The research sample consisted of students in the last year of the Psychology teacher training program (N=22). We assumed that innovated course descriptions will be evaluated positively from the point of view of better explicitness and understandability. The research method was the original questionnaire created by M. Verešová, & Ľ. Pilárik (2013). It was targeted on the evaluation of nine parameters of the course descriptions through a five point scale where the end points expressed clear agreement and disagreement respectively, with formulated items. Statistical analysis was realised by Mann-Whitney test in SPSS 20.0 software. We accepted the standard level of statistical significance $\alpha \leq 0.05$. The acquired results allow us to support the formulated hypotheses. The results show that the innovation of the course descriptions was a progressive change which can be considered as a positive alteration of the quality increase system in education. They also show that there exists a need for a higher application of the acquired knowledge and the particularity and diversification of the methods of education, self-education and evaluation.

Peer-review under responsibility of the Sakarya University

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +421 37 6408 278
E-mail address: dmala@ukf.sk
** Corresponding author. Tel.: +421 37 6408 289
E-mail address: mceresnik@ukf.sk

Peer-review under responsibility of the Sakarya University
doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.1067

Keywords: quality increasing, evaluation, course description, learning outcomes

1. Introduction

The area of education results is a significant part of university quality evaluation. Nowadays their implementation in European university field and in field of qualifications and occupations therefore represents a demanded and supported activity (Verešová,& Čerešník, 2013). M. Blaško (2012) characterizes school quality via optimal operation of processes at school, especially the process with which are satisfied school partners and which is optimally measured and evaluated. The attention is therefore paid to the results which the school achieves as well as processes, which lead to them.

2. Learning Outcomes as a Need of the Actual University Education

The process of creation/definition of specific education results is currently supported by a combination of multiple approaches. Accordingly, the formulation of education results particularly requires an orientation in theoretical bases of tuning methodology (Gonzáles, & Wagenaar, 2008), KSC typology (Wintertog, Delamare-Le Deist, & Stringfellow, 2006), (knowledge, skills, competences), Biggs' theory in relation to education results (SOLO taxonomy) (Biggs, & Tang, 2007) or Bloom theory (Bloom et al., 1956; Krathwohl, 2002) and its revised version, which is in conditions of our university recommended as key approach (Verešová, & Čerešník, 2013).

Education results bring multiple benefits within optimization and harmonization of university studies in EU. According to D. Kennedy, A. Hyland and N. Ryan (2006), key advantages of education results are:

- Clear overview of what the student should achieve to be successful,
- precision,
- easier definition compared to education targets,
- transparency.

Above state advantages of education results are expanded by M. Verešová (2013) as follows:

- they help students in observation of education process and address teachers' expectations,
- they help students in decision making when selecting a study program as well as by enrolment of subject (mandatory or optional),
- they help teachers to aim the curriculum and direct students' expectations,
- they help to synchronize content with methods (education and learning) and with expected or achieved "performance" and its evaluation,
- together with the criterion of student's study load, they enable to correctly set the credit value of education item (subject, module, study part),
- they create space for fluency and consistency of education aims in the direction of progressing demands and the enable to verify how individual study program subjects or modules link up within the education process and increase of knowledge, skills and competences,
- they simplify the proposal of curriculum by visualizing the "overlapping" areas between study programs (primarily related) and subjects within one study program,
- clearly define the subject field of study, study program for the purpose of accreditation and evaluation,
- they have key role as reference points when creating evaluation standards, they help to improve evaluation methodology of study programs quality,
- they improve the effectiveness of student's mobility in the area of curriculum comprehension and performance standard of appropriate study program which is a subject of student's mobility on a different university and improve the transfer of study results at various universities,
- they offer information to prospective employers about gained competences of graduates in individual study fields,
- they simplify the comparison of study programs equivalency in the process of recognizing foreign university qualifications.

The biggest advantages of unified approach to education results description on the level of study programs and their disciplines are: clarity, precision and transparency when describing student's requisites for being successful; help when observing the education process and reflexion of educator's expectations; possibility to improve the evaluation methodology of study programs quality; offering information about competences for prospective employers and many others (Verešová, Čerešník, 2013).

Education results, as being perceived by ESG based quality system also valid on our university, are measurable and verifiable set of information, skills and/or competences, gained by individual and/or is able to present not only at the end of education process as whole but also at the end of every module, block of study program, even after the end of every subject within the study program.

3. Method

22 second grade students of Psychology master's teaching program in academic year 2012/2013 participated in the research. This means all the students who have had experience with appropriate subjects of their study program. Some evaluations were however omitted from the analysis because of incompleteness. Therefore we can see lower quantities in some of the charts and groups (Results section).

To measure the effectiveness of education results implementation, we used an originally compiled questionnaire named "Quality of subject course descriptions from the point of view of education results at UKF Nitra" (Verešová, & Pilárik, 2013). The questionnaire contained header area for information about grade, study level, form and study program. In the second part there was a space for identification of evaluated discipline (subject course description). The third part represented the instruction for evaluation of presented form of course description (not a vision or required perspective) within nine selected parameters and two of their qualities. The fourth part contained a representation of nine parameters (knowledge, abilities, topics, methods – knowledge, methods – abilities, preparation – knowledge, preparation – abilities, evaluation – knowledge, evaluation – abilities). These were evaluated by participants using two qualities – explicitness and understandability. Qualities of selected ILP parameters were evaluated on a scale of 1 to 4 (1 – definitely agree, 2 – partially agree, 3 – partially disagree, 4 – definitely disagree, N – not able to evaluate). The aim of the research was to verify the quality of course descriptions without introduced education results and with introduced education results defined based on revised Bloom taxonomy methodology. The output was then a comparison of explicitness and understandability statements of 9 observed course descriptions quality parameters:

1. description of expected knowledge,
2. description of expected abilities,
3. content standard (topics which create the content of education),
4. methods of knowledge acquisition of a student, related to educator's didactic activity,
5. methods of ability acquisition of a student, related to educator's didactic activity,
6. methods of knowledge acquisition of a student by independent studying,
7. methods of ability acquisition of a student by independent studying,
8. methods of teacher's final evaluation of acquired student's knowledge,
9. methods of teacher's final evaluation of acquired student's abilities.

In the charts in chapter Results are these parameters introduced under the acronym which represents the identification by "item", number which represents the numeric order of a parameter (1-9) and letter "e" and "u", representing the terms "explicitness" and "understandability".

We hypothesized that:

H1: innovated course descriptions will be evaluated by students as being more explicit.

H2: innovated course descriptions will be evaluated by students as being more understandable.

4. Results

To test the hypotheses we used Mann-Whitney test for two independent selections in SPSS 20.0 software. The reason for this was an abnormal data distribution of the observed variables. We accepted the standard level of significance $\alpha \leq 0.05$. Analysis results are presented in charts 1 to 6.

Table 1. Comparison of original and innovated course description in subject "Psychodiagnostics in School"

Psychodiagnostics in School														
	Original course description						Innovated course description							
	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	U	p
i1e	21	-2	2	1.24	0.26	1.179	22	1	2	1.77	0.09	0.429	177.0	0.111
i2e	21	-2	2	0.95	0.29	1.322	22	-2	2	1.27	0.25	1.162	199.5	0.399
i3e	20	-1	2	1.05	0.26	1.146	22	1	2	1.73	0.10	0.456	**147.0**	**0.035**
i4e	21	-2	2	0.05	0.35	1.596	22	-2	2	0.59	0.30	1.403	181.5	0.210
i5e	21	-2	2	-0.10	0.34	1.546	22	-2	2	0.64	0.26	1.217	167.5	0.103
i6e	21	-2	2	-0.48	0.34	1.569	22	-2	2	0.73	0.32	1.486	**140.0**	**0.021**
i7e	21	-2	2	-0.43	0.34	1.535	22	-2	2	0.09	0.34	1.601	187.5	0.271
i8e	21	-2	2	0.71	0.33	1.521	21	-2	2	0.81	0.34	1.569	211.5	0.809
i9e	21	-2	2	0.76	0.32	1.446	21	-2	2	1.14	0.33	1.493	167.5	0.145
	Original course description						Innovated course description							
	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	U	p
i1u	21	-2	2	1.33	0.23	1.065	22	1	2	1.77	0.09	0.429	179.5	0.127
i2u	21	-2	2	0.95	0.29	1.322	22	-2	2	1.41	0.23	1.054	186.5	0.228
i3u	20	-1	2	1.20	0.20	0.894	22	-1	2	1.73	0.15	0.703	**130.0**	**0.008**
i4u	21	-2	2	0.10	0.34	1.546	22	-2	2	0.86	0.29	1.356	161.0	0.075
i5u	21	-2	2	-0.29	0.33	1.521	22	-2	2	0.64	0.26	1.217	**151.5**	**0.043**
i6u	21	-2	2	-0.33	0.36	1.653	22	-2	2	0.73	0.32	1.486	**153.5**	**0.050**
i7u	21	-2	1	-0.71	0.29	1.309	22	-2	2	0.36	0.35	1.649	**143.5**	**0.027**
i8u	21	-2	2	0.86	0.30	1.389	21	-2	2	0.86	0.33	1.493	214.0	0.860
i9u	21	-2	2	0.86	0.30	1.389	21	-2	2	1.14	0.33	1.493	169.5	0.159

Legend: N = count; Min = minimal measured value; Max = maximal measured value; AM = average mean; SEM = standard error of mean; SD = standard deviation; U = value of Mann-Whitney test; p = significance

Table 2. Comparison of original and innovated course description in subject "Didactics of Psychology"

Didactics of Psychology														
	Original course description						Innovated course description							
	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	U	p
i1e	21	-2	2	1.17	0.18	1.146	21	-1	2	1.62	0.16	0.740	338.0	0.089
i2e	21	-2	2	0.78	0.19	1.235	21	-1	2	1.62	0.16	0.740	**242.5**	**0.002**
i3e	20	-1	2	1.52	0.13	0.833	20	-1	2	1.50	0.21	0.946	411.0	0.869
i4e	21	-2	2	-0.62	0.25	1.547	21	-2	2	1.05	0.21	0.973	**184.0**	**< 0.001**
i5e	21	-2	2	-0.86	0.22	1.424	21	-2	2	1.00	0.24	1.095	**149.5**	**< 0.001**
i6e	21	-2	2	-0.56	0.23	1.501	21	-2	2	0.76	0.29	1.338	**210.5**	**0.001**
i7e	21	-2	2	-0.90	0.21	1.340	21	-2	2	0.67	0.35	1.592	**209.0**	**< 0.001**
i8e	21	-2	2	0.93	0.22	1.404	21	-1	2	1.33	0.20	0.913	386.5	0.387
i9e	21	-2	2	0.40	0.24	1.547	21	-1	2	1.29	0.23	1.056	**283.5**	**0.015**
	Original course description						Innovated course description							
	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	U	p
i1u	21	-2	2	1.36	0.15	0.983	21	1	2	1.76	0.10	0.436	347.0	0.105
i2u	21	-2	2	1.02	0.18	1.158	21	-1	2	1.67	0.16	0.730	**285.5**	**0.012**
i3u	20	-1	2	1.66	0.11	0.728	20	-1	2	1.60	0.17	0.754	388.0	0.660
i4u	21	-2	2	-0.50	0.26	1.617	21	-2	2	0.86	0.22	1.014	**232.5**	**0.002**
i5u	21	-2	2	-0.81	0.23	1.502	21	-2	2	1.19	0.23	1.030	**145.5**	**< 0.001**

i6u	21	-2	2	-0.51	0.25	1.567	21	-2	2	1.05	0.27	1.244	**190.5**	**< 0.001**
i7u	21	-2	2	-0.74	0.23	1.466	21	-2	2	0.62	0.36	1.658	**238.0**	**0.002**
i8u	21	-2	2	0.98	0.21	1.370	21	-1	2	1.29	0.23	1.056	382.5	0.351
i9u	21	-2	2	0.48	0.23	1.502	21	-1	2	1.43	0.24	1.076	**246.0**	**0.003**

Legend: N = count; Min = minimal measured value; Max = maximal measured value; AM = average mean; SEM = standard error of mean; SD = standard deviation; U = value of Mann-Whitney test; p = significance

Table 3. Comparison of original and innovated course description in subject "School and Pedagogical Psychology in Praxis"

School and Pedagogical Psychology in Praxis														
	Original course description						Innovated course description							
	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	U	p
i1e	21	-2	2	0.71	0.29	1.309	15	-1	2	1.60	0.21	0.828	**89.0**	**0.028**
i2e	21	-2	2	-0.29	0.33	1.521	15	-1	2	1.67	0.21	0.816	**42.0**	**< 0.001**
i3e	21	-1	2	1.62	0.20	0.921	14	-1	2	1.57	0.23	0.852	135.0	0.702
i4e	21	-2	1	-1.52	0.20	0.928	15	-2	2	0.73	0.30	1.163	**30.5**	**< 0.001**
i5e	21	-2	1	-1.62	0.16	0.740	15	-2	2	0.67	0.29	1.113	**25.5**	**< 0.001**
i6e	21	-2	2	-0.57	0.30	1.363	15	-1	2	0.73	0.35	1.335	**77.0**	**0.009**
i7e	20	-2	1	-0.90	0.25	1.119	15	-2	2	0.73	0.42	1.624	**66.5**	**0.004**
i8e	21	-2	2	0.48	0.30	1.365	15	-1	2	1.47	0.27	1.060	**85.0**	**0.019**
i9e	21	-2	2	-0.33	0.32	1.461	15	-1	2	1.20	0.31	1.207	**61.5**	**0.001**
	Original course description						Innovated course description							
	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	U	p
i1u	21	-2	2	0.86	0.28	1.276	15	1	2	1.73	0.12	0.458	**92.0**	**0.036**
i2u	21	-2	2	-0.05	0.35	1.596	15	1	2	1.87	0.09	0.352	**47.5**	**< 0.001**
i3u	21	-1	2	1.71	0.16	0.717	14	-1	2	1.57	0.23	0.852	133.0	0.654
i4u	21	-2	2	-1.52	0.20	0.928	15	-2	2	0.53	0.31	1.187	**36.0**	**< 0.001**
i5u	21	-2	2	-1.43	0.24	1.076	15	-2	2	0.93	0.33	1.280	**35.0**	**< 0.001**
i6u	21	-2	2	-0.48	0.31	1.401	15	-1	2	1.07	0.30	1.163	**64.0**	**0.002**
i7u	20	-2	2	-0.75	0.29	1.293	15	-2	2	0.60	0.43	1.682	**81.0**	**0.021**
i8u	21	-2	2	0.86	0.28	1.276	15	-1	2	1.27	0.32	1.223	118.0	0.214
i9u	21	-2	2	-0.29	0.33	1.521	15	-1	2	1.33	0.32	1.234	**58.5**	**0.001**

Legend: N = count; Min = minimal measured value; Max = maximal measured value; AM = average mean; SEM = standard error of mean; SD = standard deviation; U = value of Mann-Whitney test; p = significance

Table 4. Comparison of original and innovated course description in subject "The Basics of Psychological Methodology"

The Basics of Psychological Methodolgy														
	Original course description						Innovated course description							
	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	U	p
i1e	21	-2	2	0.48	0.32	1.470	12	-1	2	1.50	0.26	0.905	**70.0**	**0.036**
i2e	21	-2	2	-0.43	0.29	1.326	12	-1	2	1.50	0.26	0.905	**29.5**	**< 0.001**
i3e	21	-2	2	0.19	0.38	1.721	11	-1	2	1.36	0.28	0.924	72.5	0.088
i4e	21	-2	2	-1.29	0.26	1.189	12	1	2	1.33	0.14	0.492	**18.0**	**< 0.001**
i5e	21	-2	1	-1.48	0.20	0.928	12	1	2	1.50	0.15	0.522	**6.0**	**< 0.001**
i6e	21	-2	2	-0.52	0.33	1.504	12	-2	2	0.42	0.43	1.505	80.5	0.089
i7e	20	-2	1	-1.05	0.29	1.276	12	-2	2	0.08	0.50	1.730	75.0	0.083
i8e	21	-2	2	0.33	0.34	1.560	12	-1	2	1.00	0.30	1.044	97.0	0.291
i9e	21	-2	2	-0.19	0.34	1.569	12	-1	2	0.92	0.36	1.240	**73.5**	**0.048**
	Original course description						Innovated course description							
	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	U	p
i1u	21	-2	2	0.81	0.32	1.470	12	1	2	1.75	0.13	0.452	78.0	0.075
i2u	21	-2	2	-0.29	0.33	1.521	12	1	2	1.75	0.13	0.452	**36.0**	**< 0.001**
i3u	21	-2	2	0.43	0.36	1.630	11	-1	2	1.45	0.28	0.934	74.5	0.104

i4u	21	-2	2	-1.14	0.28	1.276	12	-1	2	1.00	0.21	0.739	**30.0**	**< 0.001**
i5u	21	-2	1	-1.43	0.20	0.926	12	1	2	1.58	0.15	0.515	**5.0**	**< 0.001**
i6u	21	-2	2	-0.38	0.37	1.687	12	-2	2	0.92	0.42	1.443	**72.5**	**0.044**
i7u	20	-2	2	-0.85	0.34	1.531	12	-2	2	-0.08	0.50	1.730	88.0	0.224
i8u	21	-2	2	0.43	0.34	1.535	12	-1	2	0.83	0.35	1.193	110.5	0.567
i9u	21	-2	2	-0.05	0.33	1.532	12	-1	2	1.08	0.38	1.311	**68.5**	**0.030**

Legend: N = count; Min = minimal measured value; Max = maximal measured value; AM = average mean; SEM = standard error of mean; SD = standard deviation; U = value of Mann-Whitney test; p = significance

Table 5. Comparison of original and innovated course description in subject "Statics in Social Sciences"

Statistics in Social Sciences														
	Original course description						Innovated course description							
	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	U	p
i1e	21	-2	2	0.57	0.29	1.326	11	1	2	1.64	0.15	0.505	**61.0**	**0.031**
i2e	21	-2	2	0.10	0.34	1.546	11	1	2	1.91	0.09	0.302	**38.0**	**0.001**
i3e	21	-1	2	1.43	0.20	0.926	11	1	2	1.55	0.16	0.522	112.0	0.907
i4e	21	-2	2	-1.29	0.31	1.419	11	1	2	1.45	0.16	0.522	**23.0**	**< 0.001**
i5e	21	-2	1	-1.67	0.20	0.913	11	1	2	1.64	0.15	0.505	**4.0**	**< 0.001**
i6e	21	-2	2	-0.76	0.36	1.640	11	-2	2	0.27	0.51	1.679	70.0	0.074
i7e	20	-2	1	-1.30	0.27	1.218	11	-2	2	-0.55	0.56	1.864	85.0	0.317
i8e	21	-2	2	0.71	0.29	1.309	11	-1	2	0.64	0.34	1.120	107.5	0.755
i9e	21	-2	2	-0.05	0.35	1.596	11	-1	2	0.91	0.39	1.300	69.0	0.067
	Original course description						Innovated course description							
	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	U	p
i1u	21	-2	2	0.62	0.32	1.465	11	1	2	1.91	0.09	0.302	**51.0**	**0.009**
i2u	21	-2	2	0.29	0.33	1.521	11	1	2	1.91	0.09	0.302	**44.0**	**0.004**
i3u	21	-1	2	1.38	0.20	0.921	11	1	2	1.64	0.15	0.505	104.0	0.667
i4u	21	-2	2	-1.29	0.31	1.419	11	1	2	1.18	0.12	0.405	**29.0**	**< 0.001**
i5u	21	-2	1	-1.67	0.20	0.913	11	1	2	1.55	0.16	0.522	**5.0**	**< 0.001**
i6u	21	-2	2	-0.71	0.35	1.617	11	-2	2	0.36	0.53	1.748	72.5	0.088
i7u	20	-2	2	-1.30	0.30	1.342	11	-2	2	-0.55	0.56	1.864	83.5	0.279
i8u	21	-2	2	0.62	0.30	1.359	11	-1	2	0.64	0.34	1.120	111.0	0.876
i9u	21	-2	2	0.10	0.36	1.640	11	-1	2	1.00	0.41	1.342	72.5	0.088

Legend: N = count; Min = minimal measured value; Max = maximal measured value; AM = average mean; SEM = standard error of mean; SD = standard deviation; U = value of Mann-Whitney test; p = significance

Table 6. Comparison of original and innovated course description in subject "Psychodiagnostcs of Children"

Psychodiagnostics of Children														
	Original course description						Innovated course description							
	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	U	p
i1e	21	1	2	1.62	0.11	0.498	12	-1	2	1.58	0.26	0.90	113.50	0.645
i2e	21	-1	2	1.43	0.16	0.746	12	-1	2	1.67	0.26	0.89	91.00	0.200
i3e	21	1	2	1.81	0.09	0.402	12	-1	2	1.50	0.26	0.91	106.00	0.471
i4e	21	-2	2	-1.43	0.24	1.076	12	-2	2	0.50	0.34	1.17	**35.50**	**< 0.001**
i5e	21	-2	1	-1.62	0.16	0.740	12	-2	2	0.50	0.34	1.17	**24.50**	**< 0.001**
i6e	21	-2	2	-0.57	0.36	1.630	12	-1	2	0.75	0.39	1.36	**64.50**	**0.020**
i7e	21	-2	1	-1.38	0.20	0.921	12	-2	2	0.58	0.51	1.78	**52.50**	**0.005**
i8e	21	-2	2	0.67	0.33	1.494	12	-1	2	1.42	0.34	1.17	85.00	0.131
i9e	21	-2	2	-0.43	0.36	1.630	12	-1	2	1.17	0.39	1.34	**53.50**	**0.005**
	Original course description						Innovated course description							
	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	N	Min	Max	AM	SEM	SD	U	p
i1u	21	1	2	1.71	0.10	0.463	12	1	2	1.75	0.13	0.452	121.5	0.868
i2u	21	-1	2	1.43	0.16	0.746	12	1	2	1.83	0.11	0.389	86.0	0.141
i3u	21	-1	2	1.62	0.20	0.921	12	-1	2	1.50	0.26	0.905	110.0	0.567

i4u	21	-2	2	-1.43	0.24	1.076	12	-2	2	0.33	0.36	1.231	**38.5**	**0.001**
i5u	21	-2	1	-1.48	0.20	0.928	12	-2	2	0.67	0.38	1.303	**29.0**	**< 0.001**
i6u	21	-2	2	-0.43	0.38	1.720	12	-1	2	0.92	0.36	1.240	**68.5**	**0.030**
i7u	21	-2	1	-1.19	0.26	1.167	12	-2	2	0.42	0.53	1.832	**60.0**	**0.013**
i8u	21	-2	2	0.48	0.32	1.470	12	-1	2	1.17	0.39	1.337	86.0	0.141
i9u	21	-2	2	-0.24	0.38	1.758	12	-1	2	1.25	0.39	1.357	**60.0**	**0.013**

Legend: N = count; Min = minimal measured value; Max = maximal measured value; AM = average mean; SEM = standard error of mean; SD = standard deviation; U = value of Mann-Whitney test; p = significance

We discovered significant differences in explicitness and understandability of individual study subjects. We specifically discovered the following differences when judging explicitness:

- in the subject Psychodiagnostics in School (Table 1.) in item content standards (i3e) and methods of knowledge and abilities acquisition (i6e);
- in the subject Didactics of Psychology (Table 2.) in items description of expected abilities (i2e), methods of student's knowledge acquisition related to teacher's didactic activity (i4e), methods of student's knowledge acquisition related to teacher's didactic activity (i5e), methods of knowledge acquisition by student's self-study (i7e), methods of teacher's final evaluation of student's ability (i9e);
- in the subject School and Pedagogical Psychology in Praxis (Table 3.) in all items except the item content standard (i3e);
- in the subject The Basics of Psychological Methodology (Table 4.) in items description of expected knowledge (i1e), description of expected abilities (i2e), methods of student's knowledge acquisition related to teacher's didactic activity (i4e), methods of student's ability acquisition related to teacher's didactic activity (i5e), methods of teacher's final evaluation of student's acquired abilities (i9e);
- in the subject Statistics in Social Sciences (Table 5.) in items description of expected knowledge (i1e), description of expected abilities (i2e), methods of student's knowledge acquisition related to teacher's didactic activity (i4e), methods of student's ability acquisition related to teacher's didactic activity (i5e);
- in the subject Psychodiagnostics of Children (Table 6.) methods of student's knowledge acquisition related to teacher's didactic activity (i4e), methods of student's ability acquisition related to teacher's didactic activity (i5e), methods of knowledge acquisition by student's self-study (i6e), methods of ability acquisition by student's self-study (i7e), methods of teacher's final evaluation of student's ability (i9e).

When judging understandability, we discovered differences in identical items in almost all subjects. The exceptions are:

- the subject Psychodiagnostics in School, where we also observed differences in items methods of student's knowledge acquisition by self-study (i6u), methods of student's ability acquisition by self-study (i7u)
- the subject The Basics of Psychological Methodology, where we also observed the difference in the item methods of student's knowledge acquisition by self-study (i6u) and haven't observed the difference in item description of expected knowledge (i1u).

5. Discussion

Based on the above stated findings we could establish that innovation of course descriptions of teacher's study program Psychology was positively perceived. Students valued increased explicitness and understandability. Every subject had its own particularity considering statistically significant differences, which shows heterogeneous quality of original course descriptions. Despite not having found significant differences in all observed items, we believe that the defined hypotheses could be supported. We point out that innovation of course descriptions from the point of view of defining expected knowledge and abilities, education standard, work methods and evaluation methods is a way of increasing university education quality specifically in Psychology teacher's field of study. We could also point out that the biggest challenge when working with expectations regarding students and their study results is (1) the area of abilities, or application level of acquired knowledge and (2) area of work methods, whether on educator's or student's side, and furthermore an explicitly phrased answer to the question: "What are the means of achieving the expected education results?".

References

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2007). *Teaching for Quality Learning at Univesity. What the Student Does. (3rd edition)*. Bergshire: McGraw-Hill.

Blaško, M. (2012). *Úvod do modernej didaktiky II. (Manažérstvo kvality v škole). Aktualizované vydanie*. Košice: KIP TU.

Bloom, B.S., Engelhart, M.D., Furst, E.J., Hill, W.H., & Krathwohl, D.R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The clasiffication of educational goals*. Handbook 1: Cognitive domain. New York: David McKay.

Gonzáles, J., & Wagenaar, R. (2008). Universities´ contribution to the Bologna Process. An introduction. (2nd edition). Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto.

Kennedy, D., Hyland, Á., & Ryan, N. (2006). *Writing and Using Learning Outcomes: a Practical Guide*. Available on: <http://sss.dcu.ie/afi/docs/bologna/writing_and_using_learning_outcomes.pdf>.

Krathwohl, D.R. 2002. A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: An overview. *Theory and Practice*, 41 (4), pp. 212-218.

Veršová, M. (2013). *Implementácia výsledkov vzdelávania do študijných programov v kontexte nadnárodných a národných prístupov a Systému riadenia kvality UKF v Nitre*. In: *Hodnotenie kvality informačných listov predmetov vybraných študijných programov študentmi v kontexte implementácie výsledkov vzdelávania*. Nitra : UKF.

Verešová, M., Čerešník, M. (2013). *Výsledky vzdelávania a ich implementácia do študijných programov*. Nitra: UKF.

Verešová, M., Žilová, R., & Vozár L. (2012). *Kvalita vzdelávania na UKF v Nitre: monitoring a vyhodnotenie implementácie európskych noriem a smerníc (ESG)*. Nitra: UKF.

Wintertog, J., Delamare – Le Deist, F., & Stringfellow, E. (2006). *Typology of knowledge, skills and competences: clarification, of the concept and the prototype.* Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.